

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 4, 5, and 7. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 4, 5, and 7, replace the original sheets including Figures 4, 5, and 7.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14-15, and 37-61 are now pending in the application with claims 1-4, 7-9, and 37-58 having previously been withdrawn. Claims 5, 6, 10, 11, 14 and 15 are currently amended. Claims 12 and 13 are cancelled. Claims 59-61 are new. Support for the foregoing amendment can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed and as amended herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

Applicant has replaced "location" and "location information" with "address" and "address information," respectively, in Figures 4, 5, and 7 of the drawings in order to support the relevant amendments made to the claims.

SPECIFICATION

Applicant has made minor amendments to the specification, replacing "address information" for "location information," to thereby adopt more conventional terminology. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments make the specification more clear.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 14 and 15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant has rewritten the claims in independent form and, therefore, requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 5-6 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants have amended claims 5-6 so that they recite a specific machine, namely, a server comprising receiving unit, issuing-and-validating unit and storing unit. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Regarding claims 10-15, these have also been redrafted. Claim 10 recites a statutory process in that the method operates on (transforms) data that represent physical objects, namely, address information specifying specific communication devices, and it uses a specific machine.

Claim 15 is drawn to a statutory article of manufacture (computer readable medium). The subject matter stored on this computer readable medium is statutory for the same reasons as expressed above in connection with claims 5-6—the data being manipulated represents physical objects, namely, address information of specific communication devices.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5-6 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter

which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Reconsideration in light of the amendments is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 5-6 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huitema (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0056094). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Huitema discloses a method of ensuring secure peer-to-peer communication by validating an ID certificate for a peer node's IP address. This ID certificate includes a certificate version, a public key of a peer node, an ID (corresponding to a hash of the public key), a period of validity for the ID certificate, and the like. Therefore, the ID certificate of Huitema is different from the "public key certificate" of the present invention.

Further, none of the portions pointed out by the Examiner disclose the "issuing-and-validating unit" ("issuing" and "validating") and the "storing unit" ("storing") recited in the amended claims 5, 10, 11, 14 and 15.

The claims, as amended, now recite applicants' use of the "public key certificate" and also recite the issuing-and-validating unit that issues this public key certificate. These aspects are not found in Huitema. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that applicants' invention is different from and fully distinguished from Huitema.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 11, 2008

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/ _____
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/dec